Received in the Patent and Trademark Office

INVENTOR: Bergman et al.

TITLE: Apparatus and Methods for Auctioning Time and
Desktop Space to Product and Service Suppliers

Enclosed:
1. Transmittal Document (in duplicate); and
2. Appeal Brief (in triplicate).

Client: **IBM Corporation**
Serial No. 09/670,446
Docket No. YOR9-2000-0504-US1   Date Mailed: 03.09.04
DWY/act

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Bergman et al.**	§	Group Art Unit: **3624**
	§	
Serial No.: **09/670,446**	§	Examiner: **Akers, Geoffrey R.**
	§	
Filed: **September 26, 2000**	§	Atty Docket No.: **YOR9-2000-0504-US1**
	§	
For: **Apparatus and Methods for Auctioning Time and Desktop Space to Product and Service Suppliers**	§	

35526

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:
ENCLOSED HEREWITH:

- Appellant's Brief (in triplicate) (37 C.F.R. 1.192); and
- Our return postcard.

A fee of $330.00 is required for filing an Appellant's Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Duke W. Yee
Duke W. Yee
Registration No. 34,285
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 367-2001
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Bergman et al.**	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: **3624**
Serial No.: **09/670,446**	§	
	§	Examiner: **Akers, Geoffrey R.**
Filed: **September 26, 2000**	§	
	§	
For: **Apparatus and Methods for**	§	
Auctioning Time and Desktop Space to	§	
Product and Service Suppliers	§	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals
and Interferences

APPELLANT'S BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 1.192)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on January 9, 2004.

The fees required under § 1.17(c), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief is transmitted in triplicate. (37 C.F.R. 1.192(a))

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines, Inc.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-45

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: NONE
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: NONE
3. Claims pending: 1-45
4. Claims allowed: NONE
5. Claims rejected: 1-45

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-45

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There are no amendments after final rejection. Appellants note that the Advisory Action states that proposed amendments will not be entered because they do not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. However, Appellants note that no amendments are proposed after final rejection. Therefore, there is no reason for denying entry of the response filed on January 9, 2004.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention provides apparatus and methods for auctioning time and desktop space to product and service suppliers. The apparatus and methods of the present invention obtain bids from various product and service suppliers and determine which of the bids are the highest ranking bids. The particular product and service suppliers from which bids are obtained may be determined based on user preferences stored in a user profile, for example. See specification, page 10, line 27, to page 12, line 15.

Based on the ranking of the bids, commercial information from the product and/or service suppliers is presented to the user. Higher ranking bids are provided with larger display space on a user's client device display and are provided with a longer display time before cycling to the next lower ranking bid. In addition, multiple displays of commercial information may be provided at a same time with the size and duration of the displays being determined based on the ranking of the associated bid from the product/service supplier. See specification, page 13, line 1, to page 14, line 2.

ISSUES

The issues on appeal are as follows:

Whether claims 1-45 are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to explicitly define the unique characteristics of the disclosure with respect to the current art.

Whether claims 1-45 are unpatentable as being obvious over *Geller et al.* (US Patent No. 6,236,990) in view of *Walker et al.* (US Patent No. 6,131,086) and *Ojha et al.* (US Patent No. 6,598,026).

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The claims on appeal do not stand or fall in a single group, but are grouped into in the following groups for the reasons set forth in the Argument section below:

Claims 1, 5-11, 16, 20-26, 31, 32, and 34-37 form group A. Claims 2-4, 12-15, 17-19, 27-30, 33, and 38-40 form group B. Claims 41-43 form group C. Claim 44 forms group D. Claim 45 forms group E.

ARGUMENT

The Office Action rejects claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to explicitly define the unique characteristics of the disclosure with respect to the current art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

I.   The Claims Are Definite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph (Groups A-E)

The Office Action quotes the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as follows:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action proffers no analysis as to why the claims fail to define the invention. In fact, the Office Action does not present a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 indicating that the claims recite the invention of another.

Applicants submit that, contrary to the Office Action's assertions, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, claims 1-45 point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the **Appellants** regard as the invention. Certainly, the Office Action does not establish that the claims are directed to the invention of another, as stated above. Contrary to the Office Action's assertions, there is no requirement under § 112(2) that the claims address the "current art."

For at least the above reasons, Appellants submit that this rejection of claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is groundless. The above arguments were made in the response filed July 23, 2003, and in the response filed January 9, 2004. Yet, the arguments are not addressed in the Office Action issued on October 9, 2003, or the Advisory Action issued on January 14, 2004. As such, the Office Action still fails to establish any grounds whatsoever for such a rejection and Appellants respectfully request that the rejection not be sustained.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Geller et al.* (US Pat. No: 6,236,990) in view of *Walker et al.* (US Pat. No: 6,131,086) and further in view of *Ojha et al.* (US Pat. No: 6,598,026). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

II. **The Prior Art, When Considered as a Whole, Does Not Teach or Suggest Apportioning the Presentation Resources of a Digital Device in Accordance with the Ranking of Bids (Groups A and C)**

With respect to every pending claim, the Office Action states:

> As per claims 1-45 Geller teaches a method of presenting information on products and ranking these products (Abstract)(Fig 2A)(Fig 2B) and calculating user preferences (Fig 3) through filtering as well as calculating rankings and scores (col 8 lines 27-48) of products based on consumer interests. Geller further teaches a preference calculator (Fig 2A/230), and evaluation storage (Fig 2A/218) and an attribute display module (Fig 2A/222) and a product data display module (Fig 2A/220) and product selection storage (Fig 2A/250) as well as scoring products by name (Fig 2B) and placing orders (Fig 3/342). Walker teaches permitting users to purchase products (Abstract)(Fig 7)(Fig 8) of all varieties (col 3 lines 18-29) and a variety of vendors (col 5 lines 35-50) as well as allocating purchasing time for the products (Fig 11A)(Fig 11B)(col 7 lines 30-44). Walker further teaches a product database (Fig 6) and a product description for specific . products (Fig 6/630) and availability (Fig 6/645) and a product cost (Fig 6/640) as well as processing orders by customers (Figs 11a-11c). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Geller in view of Walker to teach part of the invention. The motivation to combine is to teach a system for making products available to users as enunciated by Walker (col 2 lines 3-5). Ojha teaches a method for facilitating a transaction between a buyer and seller for a product via the Internet (Abstract)(Fig 1-18)(col 2 line 46-col 8 line 32) as well as a buyer placing bids to sellers (Fig 2/210) and negotiation (Fig 2/214) including offers and counteroffers (Fig 2a) and product searching (Fig 3) through graphical user interfaces. Ojha further teaches displaying products by manufacturer and type (Fig 6) and product details and prices of all merchants (Fig 8) where a customer may bid as well as placing bids (Fig 9) and a listing of bids and asks between the parties (Fig 11) and a compilation of the number of bids above threshold prices (Fig 12) and a listing of the business rules to the merchants (Figs 13A-13D). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Geller in view of Walker and further in view of Ojha. The motivation to combine Ojha in view of Geller and Walker is to teach a method for buyers to negotiate online with sellers for products as enunciated by Ojha (col 2 lines 40-44).

Office Action, dated October 9, 2003. Appellants respectfully disagree. In fact, Appellants submit that *Geller, Walker,* and *Ojha* alone or in combination, do not disclose the features recited

in the claims.

Instead, *Geller* merely teaches a method and system for ranking products according to a user's preferences. The method and system of *Geller* include a catalog of products, which are evaluated by experts who can compare each of the products and how they rate with respect to certain attributes. See col. 2, lines 18-46. Products may then be ranked according to score presented on a display. See **FIG. 2B**.

Walker merely teaches a method and system for allowing television viewers to purchase products seen on a television program. The method and system of *Walker* includes a call center, which viewers may call to purchase products. The products are associated with a program, including a time within the program in which the product appeared. For example, if a viewer sees a television personality spill coffee on his suit, the viewer may call the call center and purchase the suit featured in the program. The operator references a database to locate the product information associated with the television program. See **FIG. 6**; col. 5, lines 10-34.

Ojha teaches a method and apparatus for brokering transactions between a buyer and one of a plurality of sellers. A bid from a buyer for a product is made available via the Internet to a seller associated with the product. The seller may then submit an acceptance of the bid or a counteroffer. See Abstract. Product information, list prices, ask prices, and bid prices are filtered and listed on a display of a buyer. See **Fig. 9**; col. 11, lines 14-57. Current bids and quote solicitations are filtered and listed on a display of a merchant. See **Fig. 11**; col. 12, lines 3-27.

In contradistinction, the present invention, as set forth in claim 1, for example, recites:

> 1.   A method of presenting information via a digital device having presentation resources, comprising:
>   **receiving bids for the presentation resources of the digital device from a plurality of product/service providers**, wherein each bid identifies a benefit, associated with a product/service of a given product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;
>   ranking the bids based on the benefit offered to the user;
>   **apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids**; and
>   presenting information for at least one of the plurality of product/service providers using the apportioned presentation resources. [emphasis added]

It is respectfully submitted that neither *Geller*, *Walker*, nor *Ohja* teaches or suggests at least

"receiving bids for the presentation resources of the digital device from a plurality of product/service providers" and "apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids," as recited in claim 1, for example. While *Ojha* does mention that sellers may submit bids, or "counteroffers," to buyers, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Ojha* of receiving bids **for the presentation resources of the digital device**, for example, and there certainly is no teaching or suggestion in *Ojha* of apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids, as a further example. The applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention; therefore, at least claim 1 cannot be rendered obvious by a combination of *Geller*, *Walker*, and *Ojha*.

The Office Action specifically states, "[I]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Geller* in view of *Walker* to teach part of the invention." Clearly, the rejection is attempting to find pieces or "parts" of the invention and to use Appellants' disclosure as a template to unite the disparate pieces in the prior art. However, as set forth in *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992), such reliance is an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Appellant's disclosure. That is, as set forth in *In re Fritch*, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art, *Geller* and *Walker* and *Ojha* cannot be properly combined to form the claimed invention. Such proposed combination can be reached only through an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Appellants' disclosure as a model for the needed changes. Appellants submit that, contrary to the Office Action's assertions, the motivation of "to teach a method for buyers to negotiate online with sellers for products," although loosely paraphrased from the teachings of *Ojha*, does not constitute a suggestion to combine with the "part" represented by the teachings of *Geller* and *Walker*.

More particularly, the bids in *Ojha* are for the purchase, or sale, of a product. The teachings of *Ojha*, as well as the motivation found therein, are not equivalent to the features and functions of claim 1, which recites at least "receiving bids **for the presentation resources of the digital device** from a plurality of product/service providers."

Furthermore, references are not properly combinable or modifiable if their intended function is destroyed. See *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 U.S.P.Q. 349 (CCPA 1959), where the

court held that, "[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious."

In the instant case, the intended function of *Geller* is to allow rank products based upon a certain attribute. As such, a user may rank products by score to identify a product that meets user preferences. On the other hand, the intended function of *Walker* is to make specific products available to television viewers when the product is identified by viewing a television program. There is no specific product identified in *Geller* and there is no need to rank products in *Walker*. At least for these reasons, the references are not combinable.

Adding the functions of *Ojha* to the combination only serves to destroy the intended function of each and every reference. While the intended function of *Ojha* is to allow merchants to make counteroffers, there is only one specific product in *Ojha*, there is no specific product in Geller, and there is no need to rank products in *Walker*. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation to add the functions of *Ojha* to the combination of *Geller* and *Walker*.

Independent claims 16 and 32 recite at least the similar subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are allowable at least for the same reasons. Since claims 5-11, 20-26, 31, and 34-43 depend from claims 1, 16, and 32, at least the same distinctions between *Geller*, *Walker*, and *Ojha* and the invention recited in claims 1, 16, and 32 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 5-11, 20-26, 31, and 34-43 recite other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 1, 5-11, 16, 20-26, 31, 32, and 34-37 be withdrawn.

III.   The Prior Art, When Considered as a Whole, Does Not Teach or Suggest Filtering out Unwanted Information from Product/Service Providers (Group B)

Claim 2, for example, recites:

2.   A method of presenting information via a digital device, comprising:
transmitting a request for information from at least one product/service provider;
filtering out unwanted information from product/service providers;
receiving the information from the at least one product/service provider,
the information identifying a benefit, associated with a product/service of the at least one product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

ranking the information based on the benefit offered to the user; and
presenting the information via the digital device in accordance with the
ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is presented more
prominently than lower ranking information.

It is respectfully submitted that neither *Geller*, *Walker*, nor *Ojha* teaches or suggests at least "transmitting a request for information from at least one product/service provider" and **"filtering out unwanted information** from product/service providers," as originally presented in claim 2, for example. In fact, these features are not addressed in the Office Action. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 2. The applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper.

Independent claims 17 and 33 recite at least similar allowable subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 2 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. At least because claims 3, 4, 12-15, 18, 19, 27-30, and 38-40 depend from claims 2, 17, and 33, at least the same distinctions between *Geller*, *Walker*, and *Ojha* and the invention recited in claims 2, 17, and 33 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 3, 4, 12-15, 18, 19, 27-30, and 38-40 recite other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 2-4, 12-15, 17-19, 27-30, 33, and 38-40 not be sustained.

IV. The Prior Art, When Considered as a Whole, Does Not Teach or Suggest Apportioning Higher Ranking Bids More Presentation Resources Than Lower Ranking Bids (Groups C-E)

Claims 41-43 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 16, and 32. Additionally, claims 41-43 recite other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference. More particularly, claims 41-43 recite, "wherein higher ranking bids are apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking bids." It is respectfully submitted that neither *Geller*, *Walker*, nor *Ojha* teaches or suggests at least "wherein higher ranking bids are apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking bids," as presented in claims 41-43. In fact, these features are not addressed in the Office Action. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 41-43. The applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Therefore, it is respectfully

submitted that the rejection is improper and Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 41-43 not be sustained.

Independent claim 44 recites at least, "apportioning an amount of the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking information." And, claim 45 recites at least, "wherein the presentation resources include at least one of display space, display duration, and audio duration." It is submitted that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest at least these features. In fact, these features are not addressed in the Office Action. The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 44 and 45. The applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 44 and 45 not be sustained.

V.   <u>Conclusion</u>

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-45 are overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully urged that the rejections of claims 1-45 not be sustained.

Stephen R. Tkacs
Reg. No. 46,430
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
PO Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

The text of the claims involved in the appeal reads:

1.   A method of presenting information via a digital device having presentation resources, comprising:

     receiving bids for the presentation resources of the digital device from a plurality of product/service providers, wherein each bid identifies a benefit, associated with a product/service of a given product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

     ranking the bids based on the benefit offered to the user;

     apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids; and

     presenting information for at least one of the plurality of product/service providers using the apportioned presentation resources.

2.   A method of presenting information via a digital device, comprising:

     transmitting a request for information from at least one product/service provider;

     filtering out unwanted information from product/service providers;

     receiving the information from the at least one product/service provider, the information identifying a benefit, associated with a product/service of the at least one product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

     ranking the information based on the benefit offered to the user; and

presenting the information via the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is presented more prominently than lower ranking information.

3.   The method of claim 2, wherein filtering out unwanted information from product/service providers includes determining if the information from the product/service providers meets criteria in a user profile.

4.   The method of claim 2, wherein filtering out unwanted information from product/service providers includes receiving a user selection of unwanted product/service provider groups.

5.   The method of claim 1, wherein each bid includes one or more of product/service identification information and an incentive to buyers of a product/service.

6.   The method of claim 1, wherein the benefit to the user is at least one of a discount, a rebate, free shipping and handling, free accessories, proximity to the user, and time urgency.

7.   The method of claim 1, wherein each bid includes one or more of a product/service code, a product/service cost ranking, an incentive type code, and a value for the incentive.

8.   The method of claim 1, wherein ranking the bids based on the benefit offered to the user includes ranking the bids based on one or more rule sets.

9.   The method of claim 1, wherein the digital device includes a display,

wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

wherein apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with

the ranking of the bids includes allocating a portion of the display space on the digital device in

accordance with the ranking of the bids.

10.   The method of claim 1, wherein the presentation resources include presentation time and

wherein apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the

ranking of the bids includes allocating presentation time on the digital device in accordance with

the ranking of the bids.

11.   The method of claim 1, wherein the digital device includes a display,

wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

wherein apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with

the ranking of the bids includes allocating a display position within the display space in

accordance with the ranking of the bids.

12.   The method of claim 2, wherein transmitting the request is performed in response to one

of logging on to a network server, booting-up the digital device, receiving an input to a user

prompt, and receiving an input from a sensor.

13.   The method of claim 2, wherein transmitting the request is performed in response to an

occurrence of an event as determined based on sensor input.

14.   The method of claim 13, wherein the sensor input includes one or more of keyboard input, audio input, input representing a measured quantity of a container, and location awareness sensor input.

15.   The method of claim 13, wherein the occurrence of an event is determined based on a comparison of the sensor input to one or more threshold limits.

16.   A system for presenting information via a presentation device having presentation resources, comprising:

a network interface for receiving bids for the presentation resources from a plurality of product/service providers, wherein each bid identifies a benefit, associated with a product/service of a given product/service provider, offered to a user;

an auction device that ranks the bids based on the benefit offered to the user and apportions the presentation resources in accordance with the ranking of the bids; and

a presentation device that presents information for at least one of the plurality of product/service providers using the apportioned presentation resources.

17.   A system for presenting information, comprising:

a transmitter for transmitting a request for information from at least one product/service provider;

a filter for filtering out unwanted information from product/service providers;

a network interface for receiving the information from the at least one product/service provider, the information identifying a benefit, associated with a product/service of the at least

one product/service provider, offered to a user;

an auction device that ranks the information based on the benefit offered to the user; and

a display device that presents the information in accordance with the ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is presented more prominently than lower ranking information.

18.   The system of claim 17, wherein the filter determines if the information from the product/service providers meets criteria in a user profile.

19.   The system of claim 17, wherein the filter receiving a user selection of unwanted product/service provider groups.

20.   The system of claim 16, wherein each bid includes one or more of product/service identification information and an incentive to buyers of a product/service.

21.   The system of claim 16, wherein the benefit to the user is at least one of a discount, a rebate, free shipping and handling, free accessories, proximity to the user, and time urgency.

22.   The system of claim 16, wherein each bid includes one or more of a product/service code, a product/service cost ranking, an incentive type code, and a value for the incentive.

23.   The system of claim 16, wherein the auction device ranks the bids based on one or more rule sets.

24.   The system of claim 16, wherein the presentation device includes a display,

wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

wherein the auction device allocates a portion of the display space in accordance with the

ranking of the bids.

25.   The system of claim 16, wherein the presentation resources include presentation time

and wherein the auction device allocates presentation time in accordance with the ranking of the

bids.

26.   The system of claim 16, wherein the presentation device includes a display,

wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

wherein the auction device allocates a display position within the display space in

accordance with the ranking of the bids.

27.   The system of claim 17, wherein the transmitter transmits the request in response to one

of logging on to a network server, booting-up the digital device, receiving an input to a user

prompt, and receiving an input from a sensor.

28.   The system of claim 17, wherein the transmitter transmits the request in response to an

occurrence of an event as determined based on sensor input.

29. The system of claim 28, wherein the sensor input includes one or more of keyboard input, audio input, input representing a measured quantity of a container, and location awareness sensor input.

30. The system of claim 28, wherein the occurrence of an event is determined based on a comparison of the sensor input to one or more threshold limits.

31. The system of claim 16, wherein the auction device and the presentation device are remotely located from one another.

32. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for presenting information via a digital device having presentation resources, comprising:

first instructions for receiving bids for the presentation resources of the digital device from a plurality of product/service providers, wherein each bid identifies an benefit, associated with a product/service of the a given product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

second instructions for ranking the bids based on the benefit offered to the user;

third instructions for apportioning the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids; and

fourth instructions for presenting information for at least one of the plurality of product/service providers using the apportioned presentation resources.

33.   A computer program product in a computer readable medium for presenting information

via a digital device, comprising:

first instructions for transmitting a request for information from at least one

product/service provider;

second instructions for filtering out unwanted information from product/service

providers;

third instructions for receiving information from at least one product/service provider, the

information identifying an benefit, associated with a product/service of the at least one

product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

fourth instructions for ranking the information based on the benefit offered to the user;

and

fifth instructions for presenting the information via the digital device in accordance with

the ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is presented more

prominently than lower ranking information.

34.   The computer program product of claim 32, wherein the second instructions for ranking

the bids based on the benefit offered to the user includes instructions for ranking the bids based

on one or more rule sets.

35.   The computer program product of claim 32, wherein the digital device includes a

display,

wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

wherein the third instructions for apportioning the presentation resources of the digital

device in accordance with the ranking of the bids includes instructions for allocating a portion of

the display space on the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids.

36.   The computer program product of claim 32, wherein the presentation resources include

presentation time and wherein the third instructions for apportioning the presentation resources

of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids includes instructions for

allocating presentation time on the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the bids.

37.   The computer program product of claim 32, wherein the digital device includes a

display,

        wherein the presentation resources include display space on the display, and

        wherein the third instructions for apportioning the presentation resources of the digital

device in accordance with the ranking of the bids includes instructions for allocating a display

position within the display space in accordance with the ranking of the bids.

38.   The computer program product of claim 33, wherein the fourth instructions for

transmitting the request are executed in response to an occurrence of an event as determined

based on sensor input.

39.   The computer program product of claim 38, wherein the sensor input includes one or

more of keyboard input, audio input, input representing a measured quantity of a container, and

location awareness sensor input.

40. The computer program product of claim 38, wherein the occurrence of an event is determined based on a comparison of the sensor input to one or more threshold limits.

41. The method of claim 1, wherein higher ranking bids are apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking bids.

42. The system of claim 16, wherein higher ranking bids are apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking bids.

43. The computer program product of claim 32, wherein higher ranking bids are apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking bids.

44. A method of presenting information via a digital device having presentation resources, comprising:

receiving information from at least one product/service provider, the information identifying a benefit, associated with a product/service of the at least one product/service provider, offered to a user of the digital device;

ranking the information based on the benefit offered to the user;

apportioning an amount of the presentation resources of the digital device in accordance with the ranking of the information such that higher ranking information is apportioned more presentation resources than lower ranking information; and

presenting the information for the at least one of the plurality of product/service providers using the apportioned presentation resources.

45.   The method of claim 44, wherein the presentation resources include at least one of display space, display duration, and audio duration.